DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 245 332 EA 016 872

AUTHOR Schmuck, Patricia A.
TITLE Women as Educators: Employees of Schools in the U.S.A., A Description and Analysis.
PUB DATE Apr 84
NOTE 76p.; Symposium paper prepared for the International Interdisciplinary Congress on Women (2nd, Groningin, The Netherlands, April 1984).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrative Organization; Educational Discrimination; *Educational History; Elementary Secondary Education; Employed Women; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Equal Protection; *Feminism; Research Methodology; *Sex Bias; *Sex Discrimination; Sex Fairness; Sex Role; Sex Stereotypes; *Women Faculty

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the roles that women have played in the public schools of the United States in the 19th and 20th centuries and analyzes changes in their status and level of participation during this period. After an introductory section addressing the purposes of the international symposium at which the paper was read, the second section provides a historical review of women's role and status in schools: as elementary and secondary teachers, as administrators, as school board members, and as federal employees. The third section addresses three issues directly related to women's role in public schools: (1) the relation between women's position in the educational hierarchy and the rise of feminism, (2) the organizational structure of schools and how women's experience in these organizations differs from men's, and (3) the legal remedies of the 20th century women's movement. The fourth and final section provides a feminist perspective on the neglect of women's ideas and experiences by most educators and historians of the American educational experience. Topics include the "universalist bias" (ascription of universality to male experience and perspectives), the "machismo bias" embedded in the methodological structures of inquiry, the "devalue of education bias," and the "contemporary school marm bias." Statistical tables are appended, along with a six-page bibliography. (TE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED245332

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Patricia A. Schmuck

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

WOMEN AS EDUCATORS: EMPLOYEES OF SCHOOLS IN THE U.S.A., A DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS

Second International Interdisciplinary
Congress on Women
Groningin, The Netherlands

by

Patricia A. Schmuck
Lewis & Clark College
Portland, Oregon

April, 1984

EA 016 872

Women as Educators: Employees of Schools
In the U.S.A., a Description and Analysis

I. Introductory Notes to this Paper and the International Symposium

II. Women's Role in Schools
- A. As Teachers
  - 1. Elementary Teachers: The Changing Sex Composition
  - 2. Secondary Teachers: A Case of a Sex Segregated Work Force
- B. As Administrators
  - 1. Elementary School Principals
  - 2. Secondary School Principals
  - 3. Superintendents
  - 4. Staff Positions: Support and Supervisory
- C. As School Board Members: The Issue of Local Control
- D. As Federal Employees: National Policy Making

III. Women as Educators: An Analysis
- A. The Platform of Feminism: An Alternative Ideology
  - 1. Precipitators of Feminism: the 19th and 20th Century Movements
  - 2. The Diversity of the Feminist Platform
  - 3. Education and the Feminist Platform
- B. The Structure of Education: Discriminatory Socialization and Mobility
  - 1. Introduction to Teaching
  - 2. Stage 1--Teaching as Anticipatory Socialization
  - 3. Stage 2--Aspiring to Leadership
  - 4. Stage 3 Formal Preparation
  - 5. Stage 4--Informal Preparation
  - 6. Stage 5--The Achievers
- C. The Legal Remedies of the 20th Century Women's Movement
  - 1. The Policies and the Laws
  - 2. Helping to Implement Equality

IV. Woman's "True" Profession and the Neglect of Women: A Feminist Perspective
- A. The Universalist Bias
- B. The Machismo Bias
- C. The Devaluing of Education Bias
- D. The Contemporary School Marm Bias

INTRODUCTORY NOTES TO THIS PAPER AND THE SYMPOSIUM, "WOMEN AS EDUCATORS: EMPLOYEES OF SCHOOLS IN EIGHT WESTERN WORLD COUNTRIES."

The purpose of this paper is to describe the roles that women have played in the public schools of the United States in the 19th and 20th centuries. Although I go beyond description and try to explain the reasons for women's status in the schools of the U.S.A., my primary purpose is description.

This paper is one among nine from eight western world countries prepared as a symposium for the Second International Interdisciplinary Congress on Women to be held in April, 1984 in the Netherlands. This is the first international symposium on women's employment in schools. Though conferences have been held about women in the labor market (Ratner, 1980) and about equal educational opportunities for girls and women (Byrne, 1978; Smock, 1981), no international meeting until this one has been devoted to women's role as employees of schools.

I hope our international perspective will not only enrich and broaden our understanding about the role women play in schools in each of our respective countries, but also reveal some similar themes and issues that transcend our cultural and national boundaries. While each country has its own unique configuration for schooling, I think we will see similar themes emerge among all Western countries, despite differences in organizational structures, educational roles, hiring practices, seniority systems, preparatory programs and educational opportunities. From my reading of the literature about women's status in other fields I expect such emerging themes may be:

--Women's entrance into the teaching force is related to the drive for common schools for all students (including girls). Schools were seen as necessary for an industrialized and democratic society.

--Women's role in schools is related to the proportion of sex-segregated or mixed-sex schools. I would hypothesize, for instance, that women fill a greater variety of positions when sex-segregated schooling is the norm than when co-education is the norm.

--The variety of roles held by women in schools is related to the proportion of men employed in schools. The more men, the more sex-segregated will be women's roles.

--The degree to which there is an active social and political movement for women's equality is related to the kinds of jobs held by women in schools. Women will fill a greater variety of educational positions if there is a strong feminist political and social platform for equality.

--Women will more often be in top leadership positions in education where women have a voice in determining who will be chosen for such positions.

--The increased professionalization of teaching is related to a decrease in women's representation in certain positions in U.S.A. schools. Consequently, those countries requiring more credentials for certain positions will see a decrease of women in those roles.

--The social ideology concerned with women's appropriate place, especially in teaching, is related to the labor market needs of the society.

In the United States, those factors are clearly related to women's role in public schools. The sex composition of public school employees has undergone

significant changes in the last 150 years. A field once thought to be an "inappropriate" activity for women became women's "true profession," so that women constituted over 85 percent of all school teachers--a proportion not reached in any other Western country. But women who in 1926 were called "fixtures" as elementary school principals became a vanishing species only fifty years later. Despite women's high participation in public schools, women's labor in public education has been unrecognized and even devalued. Furthermore, women's participation in United States public schools is decreasing; in the last few decades fewer women have entered public education than during earlier decades and most of those who enter education fill roles already filled chiefly by women. Educational employment is increasingly sex-segregated.

The papers in this symposium are based on descriptive data. I wish to point out, however, that gathering of the data has been no small feat. In the United States, for instance, the national sources for educational statistics have not always reported employment by sex, nor are there up-to-date profiles of school empolcyment. The data are elusive and often incomplete. My frustration in gathering the data for the United States was amplified when I tried to trace similar records for other Western countries. Neither the European Council of Ministers nor the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) could supply the information I requested. Yet I knew data existed; I had seen Eileen Bryne's excellent summary for the Council of European Ministers (1978) and her book, Women In Education (1979), about England. I had contact with Anne Marie Berggrin, who had compiled data for Sweden. I could only suppose the data could be uncovered if one knew whom to ask and where to look. The idea for this symposium, indeed, came about from this elusive search for descriptive data. Even if the data were available, it was apparent that I could not bring adequate cultural interpretations to the data except in a superficial way. The meaning

of the data and the sensitivity to cultural nuances would be lost without help from people immersed in their culture. Thus this symposium was organized to bring together educational researchers from different countries to share their data and their interpretations of the data.

For two years I searched for funds to hold such a conference in the United States. Although I had the support of the Johnson Foundation and their kind offer to use the Wingspread Conference Site in Racine, Wisconsin, I was unable to secure travel funds for delegates. Time and time again, I was told that the mission of this international meeting did not meet "funding priorities". So, like women everywhere, undaunted by lack of funds, the symposium participants agreed to take the opportunity provided by the Second International Interdisciplinary Congress on Women and meet in the Netherlands. At this conference our meetings will accomplish the following:

--Describe the role of women in schools in our respective countries in a prepared paper.

--Transcend our unique cultural histories and develop prevailing themes which may lead to further studies.

--Suggest policies aimed at corrective action to improve women's status in schools.

--Establish next steps to extend our research to additional countries in other parts of the world.

The symposium participants include:

Ilse Brehmer
Universitat Bielefeld
Fakultat Pedagogik
4800 Bielefeld 1
WEST GERMANY

Birgit Brock-Utne
Inst. for Educ. Research
P.b. 1092 Blindern
N-Oslo 3 (45-53-95)
NORWAY

Uta Enders--Dragasser
Institut Fur Soziologie
der JLU Giessen (6300 Giesser)
Karl-Glockner Str 21
WEST GERMANY

Fanny Fenwick
100 Mortimer Terrace
Wellington 2
NEW ZEALAND

Cecilia Reynolds
2353 Buttonbush Cres.
Mississauga, Ontario L4L 1C4
CANADA

Anne Marie Berggren
Gyllenstiernas Vag 33
18350 Taby
SWEDEN

Anna Liisa Sysiharju
Taivaanvuohertie 5 A 10
SF 00200
Helsinki 20
FINLAND

Patricia Schmuck
Educational Administration
Lewis and Clark College
Portland, OR 97219
U.S.A.

Dale Spender
4 Rossetti House
Flood Street
London SW3 5TF
ENGLAND

*I thank Charol Shakeshaft, Sakre Oller, Phillip Runkel, Richard Schmuck, Dan Duke, Carol Urzua and Sharon Rogers for helpful criticisms of an earlier draft of this paper.

WOMEN'S ROLE IN SCHOOLS: A DESCRIPTION

Women have always played an important part in U.S.A. education, but their levels of participation have shifted dramatically over the past 300 years.

Women's Role as Teachers

In colonial North America before the U.S.A. was founded, the teaching of basic skills in reading, writing and arithmetic was the task of women, carried out by wives and mothers at home or by women working with groups of youngsters in neighborhood Dame Schools. Some towns offered fees to successful teachers who would offer their services regularly to the youngest children. In 1682 the town of Springfield, Massachusetts contracted with "Goodwife Mirick to encourage her in the good work of training up the children, and teaching children to read, and that she should have three pence a week for every child that she takes to perform this good work for" (Kerber, 1981, p. 3). Girls and boys both attended the Dame Schools, but the next level of education, the Grammar School, was intended primarily for boys who were taught by a male schoolmaster. Although there were some isolated examples of women teaching grammar schools in colonial America, most formal contractual agreements were with men hired to teach children seven years or older. More and more communities established schools through formal arrangements, and the male schoolmaster prevailed throughout the 17th and 18th centuries and the early part of the 19th century. At the time the U.S.A. was formally constituted in 1776, it was not considered appropriate nor

desirable to hire women as teachers. But that attitude reversed itself 180 degrees when the industrialization of the eastern seaboard and the movement of pioneers westward created so much employment opportunity for men that schools could no longer attract enough males. Women were called into duty.

By 1860 a majority of teachers were women. Indeed, since the Civil War, women have always outnumbered men as employees in schools. In 1870, women constituted 66 percent of teachers, in 1900 70 percent, and in 1920 85 percent, but in 1983, women have returned to their earlier proportion--at 66 percent (Tyack and Strober, 1981; NEA, 1983). And of black teachers, about 50 percent were women in 1900 (Collier-Thomas, 1982). In 1938, the ranks of women teachers were so full that Frances Donovan, a journalist, captured the stereotype of the teacher in a delightful book, The School Ma'am, in which she described the life of the young unmarried woman (married women were not permitted to teach until the 1940s) who left her nuclear family to teach in a rural community. This young woman was hired by the local school board and usually lived with a local family who undertook to ensure that their school teacher was the proper, upright and moral person to direct their children's education. The shift in the sex composition is illustrated in Table 1.

The shift in the sex composition of the teaching force is an interesting social phenomenon. It is curious that a role that was the province of men and considered highly inappropriate for women became, within a few years, women's second highest calling. Their first calling of course remained that of wife and mother.

Tyack and Strober (1981) explain the relevant social forces in the mid-nineteenth century: industrial employment with higher pay lured schoolmasters away from teaching, urban schools were growing rapidly with the

press for the "common" schools, and there was an influx of both rural Americans and non-English speaking immigrants into urban centers. There was a need for literate English speakers to teach. The only population that fit that social need was women; what was once inappropriate became socially desirable. School teaching became a good exercise for the young, unmarried female; it provided excellent training and experience for the care of children thus preparing her for her natural destiny of wife and mother; and it provided life-long employment for the less fortunate woman who would not be chosen to be someone's wife. It has been dramatized poignantly in our country, especially in times of war, that social ideology concerning "women's place" changes to meet the labor needs of the society. And in the South, black women became a major force in the segregated educational system at the turn of the century. Black men, like white men, were finally lured away from teaching with more lucrative employment opportunities.

The change in ideology was dramatized again in the 1940s, when married women were finally permitted to teach school. Because men were serving in the Armed Forces during World War II, married women who had been teachers were called back into educational service. Thus, again, another old notion was laid to rest; the idea that teaching was best for the young unmarried woman was replaced by another idea--that for married women, teaching was an especially suitable profession. The long summer months and the daytime teaching hours permitted women to successfully integrate both family and professional commitments.

In 1974 I interviewed Lucille Brunskill, a member of that same cohort of women and typical of the school ma'am depicted by Donovan in 1938. Brunskill entered education as an unmarried female in the 1930s, in a small town in

Oregon. As if it had happened yesterday, she vividly recounted her first job; she was not allowed to smoke or drink, and was granted only one free weekend a month. She taught students, reported to the school board, kept the budget and maintained the school buildings. She stayed in public education and retired as one of the highest ranking females in the largest school district in Oregon. Upon her retirement she, like other members of that cohort, was replaced by a man.

Not only have these women educators--the school ma'ams--been ignored by most educational historians until recently, the scholarly contributions of women educators such as Willystine Goodsell or the efforts of women such as Emma Willard or Mary McLeod Bethune to establish and run schools have not made their way into our country's educational history. For instance, Joan Burstyn, an educational historian, describes two major texts in American educational history written by men (1983). There is no mention of any woman in these texts. Where were the women? As Burstyn points out, women did write about education and made many valuable contributions. Yet educational historians have treated education as the province of men, obscuring women's place. Recently there has been a resurgence of books and articles devoted to unearthing these buried women in our educational history; Linda Kerber (1980), Nancy Hoffman (1982), Sari Knopp Biklen (1983) and Joan Burstyn (1983) are among those restoring women to their proper place in our educational history and valuing their contributions.

Elementary Teachers: The Changing Sex Composition

Shifts in the sex composition of teachers is most clearly visible in elementary schools; what was once woman's place--as far back as the Dame Schools of Colonial America--has been increasingly populated by men since they returned

from the victory of World War II. In 1949 men were 9 percent of elementary teachers; in 1983 they were 17 percent. This is shown in Table 2.

I must point out, however, that men's presence in elementary schools is higher than those figures for teachers. When one includes other non-supervisory personnel the proportion of men has grown from 21 percent in 1949 to 34 percent in 1974 and to 40 percent in 1983. That is shown in Table 3. And males who are principals of elementary schools have increased from 69 percent in 1949 to 87 percent in 1983 (Grant and Lind, 1979). Whereas women elementary school teachers, by and large, remain elementary school teachers, men in elementary school classrooms move on to other positions. For men, elementary classroom teaching is but one step in a sequence of career moves (Lortie, 1975).

Active marketing efforts have encouraged men to enter elementary schools. Indeed, some analyses have been written to show the destructive consequences of the "all female world" of the elementary school. The most flagrant example of this point of view is perhaps Patricia Sexton's charge that schools are emasculating our boys; and it is the woman teacher who is to blame (1973). This anti-woman chord was joined by a chorus of voices such as the American Association of Elementary, Kindergarten and Nursery Educators who unanimously resolved, "The association recognizes the fact that 15 percent of elementary school teachers are male and believes that your children, especially those brought up without a father in the home, need a male image, and strongly urges the recruitment of more male teachers in elementary classrooms" (Ellenburg, 1975, Shakeshaft, 1982).

The effort to bring more men into elementary teaching has been successful. And there is sufficient reason to expect a continued growth of men in elementary school teaching. The shortage of teaching jobs, the dwindling economy, as well

as men's growing consciousness about making non-sexist career choices all act as inducements for men to work with young children. Affirmative action guidelines, new in this decade, also may be assisting men. Affirmative action is the phrase used in the U.S.A. to mean the legal attempt to redress past inequities by affirmatively recruiting and hiring people from groups underrepresented in an occupation. As one female elementary teacher put it,

> If this affirmative action stuff continues we can expect to see the day when there are no more women in education. Our school district is applauded for its efforts to reduce sex bias in hiring. They are hiring male elementary teachers by the score. Interestingly enough, however, they are not as successful hiring women high school teachers or women administrators (reported in Schmuck, 1981).

As more men enter elementary education, the greater is the inducement for other men to enter the field. Males today do not acquire the stigma of doing "women's work" that they once did. As one male put it,

> It's more acceptable for a man to go into education. They now can make more salary and there is a professionalism about the field. Men in schools, especially in elementary schools, just don't bathe in lavendar water anymore (reported in Schmuck, 1975, p. 90).

Secondary School Teachers: A Case of an Internally Sex Segregated System

Today the proportion of men and women at the secondary level of teaching in U.S. public schools is roughly equal; in 1982-83, secondary school teachers were 51 percent male and 49 percent female. The proportion of male teachers in secondary schools, as in elementary schools, has increased over the years; male representation in 1929 was about 35 percent, and in 1949 about 44 percent. That is shown in Table 4.

Men who teach, however, are more often to be in secondary education, whereas women who teach are more often to be at the elementary level. As shown in Table 5, in 1982-83, 71 percent of all male teachers were in secondary schools but 67 percent of women were in elementary schools.

Why do men who enter teaching more often enter secondary teaching? And why has men's proportion of secondary school teachers increased in the past few decades? One reason is the stereotype of the 19th century "school ma'am" is more compatible to elementary school than secondary school teaching. In secondary schools one is a subject matter specialists and there is more social prestige than in elementary schools. Wages are still another reason. It is true that the difference in teachers' pay between elementary and secondary schools is small; the National Education Association (1983) gives the average salary for elementary teachers as $20,042 and for secondary teachers as $21,000. But there are opportunities for extra pay in secondary schools that do not exist in elementary schools. Examples are coaching (athletics are an important part of U.S. schools), the department chair or other quazi administrative assignments. These opportunites are more available to men than women which results in wage discrepencies.

In 1961 the mean salary for men teachers was $5,568 and for women $5,120. In 1981 the mean salary for men was $18,473 and for women, $16,558. Whereas males increased their earning power by 178 percent, women increased their earning power by 172 percent (Bartholemew and Gardner, p. 80, 1982). Said in a different way, in 1961 female teachers earned 92 percent of what male teachers earned, in 1978 this discrepency was increased to women earning only 85 percent of what men earned (Butler, 1979).

Equally important, if not more important, however, is the sex segregation

of subject matter taught by males and females in secondary schools in the U.S. This is shown in Table 6. The sex-segregation by subject matter in high school parallels sex-segregation in other occupations. Males predominate as teachers and students in those vocational areas where they also predominate as employees; these areas are also the highest paid in the work world. In college preparatory classes, the data are similar: chemistry, physics, and advanced mathematics are predominated by male students and male teachers. Current recommendations for increasing salaries of math and science teachers may, in fact, increase the already discrepant pay differences between male and female teachers. Most women secondary school teachers teach the humanities, social studies, or foreign languages. Female students and faculty are notably absent from the technical fields in vocational or pre-professional education.

So although there may appear to be an equitable division of men and women at the secondary school level by looking at numbers, further analysis shows inequity in subject matter taught and that, in turn, is directly related to inequities in the labor force.

Women as Administrators

In administrative positions in U.S. public schools women are a distinct minority. In 1981-82 women comprised only 25 percent of all such positions (Jones, 1982). Before I describe the variety of administrative roles, a brief description of the structure of American public schools is in order.

There are approximately 16,000 school disiricts in the United States. Each school district is relatively autonomous in determining the school curriculum and in hiring its own personnel. The United States Constitution emphasizes a decentralized structure of American schools; each of the fifty states is

responsible for the education of its citizens. Each of the 16,000 local school districts must abide by certain state and federal standards, but there is a strong sentiment and long history for local control of schools.

This structure of schools has clear implications for the hiring of administrators. While there are state requirements for an administrative credential, each school district writes its own job descriptions for administrators and these vary considerably. Pay also varies from district to district. An individual applies for a position within a certain district and there is a great deal of mobility from one school district to another.

Yearly, many administrative positions are open and during each spring there is a flurry of job seeking and selection. For instance, in Oregon in 1977-78 there were 300 administrative positions open in 129 districts (there are about 300 districts in Oregon). Of the 1,000 applications for these 300 spots, 19 percent were from women. Of those hired, 78 percent were men who most often filled the positions of district superintendent and building principal. The 22 percent of women who were hired most often became staff people providing coodinating and directing activities. The hirings that year in Oregon were generally in the same proportions as administrative positions held by men and women across the country. Table 7 show the distribution of males and females in all positions for the past decade. It should be noted that national statistics by sex are not available in the recent government statistics.

In the following sections I will describe the incidence of women in several administrative positions separately. Women have never been highly represented in any jobs except those of elementry school principal and those of support positions that do not include supervisory responsibilities over other adult professionals.

Elementary School Principals

The proportion of women in the elementary school principalship has changed significantly within this century. That is shown in Table 8. Gribskov (1980) says that the 1910 national census using the classification of "supervisory officers" in public schools reported that over half of those 14,000 positions were filled by women (1980). These figures likely reflect the high proportion of women elementary principals since at that time most schools were elementary buildings. In fact, women so dominated the elementary principalship that in 1926 the editors of School Life, a publication of the U.S. Bureau of Education (the forerunner of the Department of Education), published an article entitled "The Woman Principal: A Fixture in American Public Schools." Women elementary principals did not, however, turn out to be a "fixture." By World War II their representation in this position was down to 41 percent, and by 1972 it was down to 20 percent (Kalvelage, 1978). The same U.S. Bureau in 1977 published an article by Clement called "No Room at the Top," describing the obstacles facing women entering administration in education (Clement, 1977).

These national trends are mirrored in the example of the Los Angeles Public Schools, one of the largest school districts in the country. In 1908 there were 84 schools there, of which more than half had female principals; presumably most of those schools were elementary schools. By 1974 only 31 percent of the district's 591 elementary and secondary principals were women, and by 1976 the figure remained at about 30 percent (Barnes, 1976, Los Angeles, 1976).

The decrease in the numbers of female elementary principals is attributed to several causes: the increase of men in elementary teaching after World War II when the G.I. Bill gave financial aid to veterans while attending college, the increasing social acceptance of men as elementary school teachers, the

consolidation of school districts where many small rural schools consolidated into larger districts (and women who were principals of small rural schools were replaced by men who were put in charge of larger buildings), and the increased demand for additional formal training for administrative certification (Schmuck, 1975).

Pay differs considerably between men and women elementary school principals. Comparisons between men and women with similar years of experience and educational level show that women have annual salaries ranging from $800 to $3,000 less than men (Havens, 1980).

While there is some evidence that more women are returning to the position of elementary school principal (Schmuck and Wyant, 1981; Williams, 1981), it is also noteworthy that for women, as in the past, the elementary school principalship remains the terminal position they achieve in the educational hierarchy. Men more often tend to use the elementary school principalship as a stepping stone for other administrative positions. In fact, Gaertner (1981) raises the question whether it may serve the cause of educational equity to encourage women to enter this role. She says:

> . . . as a large proportion of elementary school principals and teachers are female, one might speculate that this position does not connect to the top (i.e. superintendency) for reasons that have to do with factors not related to tasks, such as discrimination based on gender . . . (p. 214).

Secondary School Principals

Women have never been very highly represented as administrators of schools with older students. In 1920, the best estimate was that about 8 percent of

secondary school principals were women; in 1965 about 10 percent of high school principals were women; that went down to about 7 percent in 1977. Most women high school principals, however, are not in public schools, but in private religious schools (Byrne and Hines and McCleary, 1978).

Most female high school principals earn considerably less than their male counterparts. Seventy percent of the women earned salaries of less than $20,000 while only 25 percent of the men earned less than that. Salaries in the highest range, $28,900 and over, were more equitably distributed; 15 percent of the women and 18 percent of the men earned that amount (NASSP, 1978, reported in Havens, 1980).

Although I have not yet done an analysis of women in private schools in the U.S., I suspect that women who are heads of private secondary schools have been and are mostly in sex segregated institutions; that is, they are heads of all girls Catholic schools, and many of the women heads are probably nuns. In Belgium, for instance, the number of women and men heads of secondary schools is about equal; women are in charge of all-girl schools, men are in charge of all-boy schools, especially in the large numbers of Catholic schools in that country. As these sex segregated institutions are moving toward co-education, however, there is a definite trend toward the hiring of males, rather than females, for the heads of schools. One can expect to see in Belgium a reduced parity between men and women heads of schools as the movement toward co-education continues (Schmuck, 1981).

Superintendents

In 1922 there were 31 female district superintendents among approximately 100,000 school districts. A decade later the number had increased but there

were still 25 states where no woman served as district superintendent (Tyack and Hansot, p. 188). And the few women superintendents were concentrated in the poorest paid and least prestigious positions in small and rural communities. That was still true in 1977. Paddock (1981) tried to find all women superintendents in the country; she reported that there were approximately 93 females superintendents in the approximatly 16,000 potential positions, and women were still in the poorest paid and the least prestigious positions. In 1982 there were 241 female superintendents which represented 1.80 percent (Jones and Mentenegro, 1982).

County superintendents. Although independent school districts in the U.S.A. are governed by state and federal laws, the county (or province) system of government also holds responsibilities for school districts. Usually the county superintendent is responsible for several school districts within the county's jurisdiction.

In the 1920s and 1930s the county superintendent was more powerful than today; usually this person was the only administrator who inspected the many rural schools. This role was targeted in the 19th century feminist push for women in education. In 1922 Edith Lathrop of the U.S. Office of Education advised women to enter these positions and noted the number of female county superintendents had increased from 276 in 1900 to 857 in 1922, mostly concentrated in the West and in places where county superintendents were elected rather than appointed (Tyack and Hansot, p. 187).

In many states this was an elected position and women were successful in gaining elective office despite not being granted suffrage nationally until 1920. There were 24 states where women could vote in school elections. By 1926 women were about 25 percent of county superintendents. Indeed, it is not

coincidental that women were gaining elective positions in those states where females were allowed to vote in school elections. This is a theme that appears time and time again. When women are part of the system that selects an educational leader, there is greater likelihood of seeing a woman chosen than when all the decision makers are men.

State Superintendents. All 50 states in the U.S. have a state superintendent of education. In 1983 there were five women state superintendents (Arizona, Wyoming, Minnesota, Hawaii, Kentucky). Some states have a long history of women as state superintendents. Colorado, for instance, had 12 women serving continuously from 1895 to 1951 (Bailey, 1983). Again, whether this state office is an elected or appointed position seems to make a difference. Women will be state superintendents more often where they are elected, where women have a voice in the selection.

Staff Positions

Many larger school districts have staff positions, those people who are responsible for coordinating or providing support for local schools. Women who are administrators are more likely to be in staff positions rather than building principals or superintendents. In 1972, 35 percent of the staff positions in the Portland, Oregon public schools were women (Schmuck, 1975). Women are more often in staff positions because such positions do not run contrary to women's stereotyped function as helper and facilitator (Ortiz, 1982). Staff people often are not involved in supervision of adult professionals; this is seen as a "man's job." Those staff positions which entail supervision of adults are usually held by men.

Women as School Board Members: The Issue of Local Control

Each of the approximately 16,000 school districts in the U.S. has its own educational hierarchy. There is no centralized federal authority in the U.S.A. The school board, composed of elected lay officials, makes school policy; the board is relatively autonomous though it must conform to certain state and federal regulations to receive funds from the state and federal government.

These elected lay officials of the school board comprise the revered system of "local control of schools." School boards are the policy makers at the district level; a school board hires the superintendent to be the implementer of policy. In reality, the actual power of a school board to determine educational policy has eroded considerably as school districts have grown into complex bureaucracies.

In 1926 and 1956 women constituted about 10 percent of local school board members; by 1976, their representation grew to about 20 percent and by 1983 it was 37 percent. Women's representation on school boards has always been higher in urban than in rural areas (NSBA, 1978, 1983).

Although the influence of women's voices on early schools has been documented (Kerber, 1980), the 19th century emphasis on education as technical skill resulted in male domination of school boards. The patriarchal view was represented in 1916 by Ellwood Cubberly, one of the first leaders and writers about educational administration. He said that those who did not make good school board members were "inexperienced young men, unsuccessful men, old men who have retired from business, politicians, saloon-keepers, uneducated or ignorant men, men in minor business positions, and women . . ."

Today the most significant task performed by boards is that of hiring school administrators--especially superintendents. Although in urban school districts screening committees often make recommendations to the board, school boards bear responsibility for the 98.2 percent of male superintendents in U.S. schools. School boards naturally want to hire the best person for the job, one in whom they can have confidence and trust. It is not surprising that predominately white and male boards tend to entrust this most sacred responsibility to another white male.

Women's Roles as Federal Employees: National Policy Making

While the U.S. system is decentralized and organized in local districts, there are state and federal regulations. At the federal level there is the Department of Education, headed by a Secretary of Education (comparable to a Minister of Education). Because the system is decentralized, the Secretary does not have power to dictate instruction, certification of personnel, or educational requirements; those matters are the prerogative of the states and the local districts. There are two main branches of the Department of Education, the Office of Education (OE) and the National Institute of Education (NIE).

Women's participation in these federal agencies is skewed; whereas women are the majority of the workers in them (54 percent for OE, 59 percent for NIE), the senior level positions are most often held by men. In 1974, the average civil service grade, known as the GS rating, for women was about 7.5; for men it was 12. Although women constitute the majority of employees, they are a notable minority in the GS-13 to GS-18 positions. In 1972 women constituted only 5 percent at these levels and 15 percent in 1976 (Steiger and Szanton, 1977).

Summary

Equality of men and women in administrative positions, on local school boards and within the federal educational agencies is, in itself, a worthy goal. Equally important is that the voice of women be heard for guiding development and implementation of educational policy. It remains, however, an unanswered question as to whether women will respond differently from men to the challenges of making educational policy or implementing educational theory. The research indicates that women and men do not differ in their treatment of boys and girls in classrooms; men and women behave in equally sex stereotyped ways. There also has been some research indicating the sex composition of a working group influences whether women's voices are offered or even heard at all; women tend to defer to males, especially when they are the lone woman in a group or are in a definite minority (Lockheed and Hall, 1976; Finigan, 1982). Carol Gilligan's research indicates that women have a "different voice" from men when it comes to making moral decisions. Women more often make decisions based on the consequences upon the people involved, men tend more often to make decisions based on abstract concepts of justice (Gilligan, 1982). Whether women have the same voice as men or a "different voice" as suggested by Gilligan, women's voices should be heard in making decisions about educational policy in the U.S.A. Women's representation should be increased as school administrators, as members school boards and in the policy making roles in the United States Government.

WOMEN AS EDUCATORS IN THE U.S.A.: AN ANALYSIS

In this section I will describe three issues directly related to women's role in public schools. First I will show that women's relative positions in the educational hierarchy are intimately tied to the ideology of feminism. I do not believe it is mere coincidence that the decrease of the number of women as elementary school principals spanned the end of the first women's movement and the beginning of the second women's movement in the 20th century. Women's representation in educational governance is related to a strong social and political drive for equality. As I will show, our feminist sisters of a century ago made significant strides to achieve educational opportunities for women and were instrumental in helping women achieve positions in educational institutions that had been theretofore unthinkable. In the 20th century the women's movement moved beyond the earlier hopes and dreams of our foremothers--we more directly attack the presumptions of patriarchy.

The second issue I discuss is the organizational structures of schools and I show how the experiences of women in those structures are different than the experiences of men. It is our understanding of both obvious and subtle organizational factors--factors made plain by feminist scholars of organizational theory--that give us insight into the ways to change systems fraught with discrimination and prejudice.

Finally, I will talk about of policy and law. Twentieth century women in

the United States have used legal remedies for discrimination to an extent unparalleled in U.S. history. Our feminist sisters a century ago fought the battle for suffrage and found hollow victory when women still gained no voice in policy and governance. The movement today is focused on changing our laws to guarantee women's full participation in all aspects of our society. Policies for equal employment and equal educational opportunities, however, do not necessarily lead to equality in practice. Equality in law is necessary, but not sufficient, for equality in practice.

These three issues, I believe, are the touchstones for understanding and changing women's position in U.S. schools. I believe that new knowledge about organizational structure and implementing equality in law depend, however, on the efforts of feminists and the guiding spirit of a feminist ideology.

The Platform of Feminism: An Alternative Ideology

Education has been a primary platform for equality in this country. While a complete history of the women's movements in the U.S.A. has been more aptly and thoroughly described elsewhere by Flexner (1959), Hole and Levine (1971), Berg (1975), Melder (1977), and Freeman (1979), a brief recounting of the feminist movements is important to understand the past and predict the future of women as employees of schools.

There have been two feminist movements in the U.S. The first movement roughly spanned the years 1820-1920, ending with the guarantee of universal suffrage for women; the second movement is often said to have begun in 1963 with the publication of Betty Friedan's book, The Feminine Mystique. Perhaps future historians will mark the end of this current movement with the 1982 defeat of the Equal Rights Amendment. Perhaps they will mark it later. Perhaps the

movement will become so infused into the society that it will be hard to identify it as a distinct movement. I cannot prophesy. Although, as I will show, our feminist sisters a century ago made significant strides toward equality in education, they did not confront the patriarchal nature of educational institutions nor development of knowledge. It is with guarded optimism that I look to the restructuring of institutions and knowledge as the primary forces that may make a lasting change in American society.

Precipitators of Feminism: The Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Movements

Not coincidentally, the political origins of both women's movements grew out of women's concerns for racial equality. It was the anti-slavery movement of the 1830s and the civil rights movement of the 1950s where women activists learned they could not function as political equals with their male allies. Perhaps the most classic example of the kind of provocation that has caused women with a concern for racial justice to turn for support to one another was when Stokely Carmichael of the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee, a committee devoted to racial justice, made his infamous remark in 1964, "The only position for women in SNCC is prone" (cited in Freeman, Jo, 1979).

A second precipitator of both women's movements was middle class women and the apparent feeling of uselessness. Historian, Barbara Berg, describes the 19th century women's movement, and points to the restricted lives of urban upper and middle class women on the eastern seaboard and their confinement to the narrow realm of domesticity. Although their affluence provided them with paid domestic services, there were few realms of social action in which they could invest their time. Many of these women, with nothing to do, lamented their uselessness. One woman said, "The greatest trial . . . is that I have nothing

to do. Here I am with abundant leisure, and capable, I believe, of accomplishing some good, and yet with no object on which to expend my energies . . . I cannot be happy without being employed" (cited in Berg, 1978, p. 112). These women with "nothing to do" formed female societies and put their energies to constructive ends by attempting to create better social conditions for other less fortunate women and many of their activities were educational.

Jo Freeman in The Politics of Women's Liberation (1975) wrote about the same issue for 20th century women. With the advent of the industrial corporate society the family was no longer an economically productive unit as it was in rural America and some woman's previously valued and needed functions became superfluous for the well-being of her family. Goods and entertainment were no longer produced; they were bought on the marketplace by the wage earner. Freeman describes how industrialization created women's increased dependence on men and led to a growing sense of becoming "useless parasites." Middle class women, although not generally deprived of resources, felt psychologically deprived as was poignantly depicted by Betty Friedan in 1963 when she named the problem that had no name:

> The problem lay buried, unspoken for many years in the minds of American women. It was a strange stirring, a sense of dissatisfaction, a yearning that women suffered in the middle of the twentieth century in the United States. Each suburban housewife struggled with it alone. As she made the beds, shopped for groceries, matched slipcover material, ate peanut butter sandwiches with her children, chauffeured Cub Scouts and Brownies, lay beside her husband at night--she was afraid to ask even of herself the silent question--"Is this all?"

The Diversity of the Feminist Platform

The first women's conference in the United States was held in 1848 in Senaca Falls, New York. Some 300 women and men approved a declaration of sentiments, modeled on the Declaration of Independence, which began,

> "We hold these truths to be self-evident: that all men and women are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness . . .

They went on:

> "The history of mankind is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations on the part of man toward woman . . . he has compelled her to submit to laws of which she has no voice . . . he has monopolized nearly all the profitable employments, and from those she is permitted to follow, she receives but a scanty remuneration . . . as a teacher of theology, medicine, or law, she is not known."

Jo Freeman points out (p. 549) that the delineation of issues in that 1848 Declaration bears a startling resemblance to contemporary feminist writings. Too often that earlier movement has been inaccurately typified as primarily concerned with suffrage. In truth the movement was very diverse. In fact that first convention, which unanimously resolved that women should have "equal participation with men in the various trades, professions and commerce," was divided about suffrage.

The second women's movement, beginning in the 1960s, remains a diverse movement of political action, the search for individual meaning, emphasis on gaining equal participation in all aspects of social life, and a strong emphasis on education.

In the 1980s there has been a deluge of books about organizations concerned

with women's issues. One of them, for instance, Carol Kleiman's Women's Networks, published in 1980, consists of about 75 pages of listings of national, state, and local networks in the U.S. The approximately 1,000 listings include organizations such as American Women in Radio and Television, the Caesarean Clearinghouse, Farm Women, Black Women's Community Development Fund, National Coalition for Women in Defense, The National Action Forum for Older Women, League of Women Composers, Homemakers Equal Rights Association, National Congress of Neighborhood Women and Coalition of Women's Art Associations and Women in Educational Administration. This is only one example of the myriad of activities comprising the women's movement today.

Education and the Feminist Platform

Gene Agre and Barbara Finkelstein (1976) classified into two groups the 19th century feminist reformers concerned with education reform for women. One category they call the tradition of "domestic feminism" embodied by Emma Willard, Mary Lyon, and Catherine Beecher who wished to extend educational opportunities to women but celebrated women's traditional roles in the society as nurturers and keepers of the community morals. These reformers did not attack the "special sphere" for women; they wanted to train women to perform their special roles better. The other reformers they refer to as "economic feminists," those such as Charlotte Perkins Gilman and Susan Anthony who stressed education as the medium by which women could achieve their economic independence and social equality. The second group wished to expand women's traditional sphere in the society and they saw educational reform as needed to create greater economic and social reform. These feminists confronted the assumptions of patriarchy head on.

One dramatic illustration of the questioning of patriarchy is provided by Susan B. Anthony, a Quaker teacher, now revered for her outspokenness and insightful critiques of education. She hit the nail on the head, to use an American idiom. In 1853 she listened with rising anger as men debated for three days about the reasons that teachers lacked the respect accorded doctors, lawyers, and ministers. Finally she asked to speak. The men argued for half an hour about whether to hear her and then, after she had stood waiting, reluctantly gave her permission to speak. "It seems to me, gentlemen," she said,

> "that none of you quite comprehend the cause of disrespect of which you complain. Do you not see that so long as society says a woman is incompetent to be a lawyer, minister, or doctor, but has ample ability to be a teacher, that every man of you who chooses that profession tacitly acknowledges that he has no more brains than a woman? . . . Would you exalt your profession, exalt those who labor with you" (reported in Tyach & Hansot, p. 65).

Educators today still grapple with this theme of women's involvement as "lowering" the profession of education.

Despite the differing views of the 19th century feminists about the kind of education for women, they garnered notable successes; by the 1830s several female seminaries were established, and Mt. Holyoke, established in 1837, Oberlin in 1841, Elmira in 1855, and Vassar in 1865 provided higher educational opportunities for women. But the curriculum in these institutions was often different for women than for men. Lucy Stone, an active feminist and a graduate of Oberlin, which was the first co-ed institution, wrote, "Oberlin's attitude was that women's highest calling was to be the mothers of the race . . . co-eds were being prepared for intelligent motherhood and a properly subservient wifehood."

They also were successful in influencing education; women spearheaded a number of educational reforms, such as kindergartens, vocational education, and even sex education. At the turn of the century, notably in the Midwest and the newly developing western states, women created and ran schools. While some of her eastern seaboard sisters "had nothing to do," women were among the pioneers traveling by covered wagons across the country and carving communities out of the wilderness.

Most of the histories the 19th century women's movement and about women in education have focused on the eastern seaboard. We are only beginning to recognize and unearth the different sagas of women in different parts of our country--the southeast with its strong Native American and Mexican population, the black women of the South, and the pioneers moving West.

Abigail Scott Dunlway was one such reformer; her formidable trip of over 2,000 miles in a covered wagon from Illinois to Oregon, her struggles as a wife and mother and her unendless energy to improve women's condition has been well told by herself (1914) as well as by Ruth Moynihan (1983).

Jesse Bernard (1976) discusses the role of women in the pioneer western movement and asserts that the conditions of the time could not afford the "separate sphere" for women that existed for the affluent and middle class women of the East. Communities had to be carved out of wilderness, and women were called upon for their full part--or more. Women were the originators of community schools and they became the teachers and the administrators. Women took many roles in the West, not only in schools, but community governance, the practice of medicine, and other community service activities. They exercised their options as citizens, as leaders, and as educators. Gribshov (1981) has told how women's active participation in the schools was connected to their

activity in all parts of the local and state communities creating a "network" of women throughout the community.

Ironically, the frustration of the suffragists at the federal level may have helped feminists at the state level with unprecedented victories in education. From the late 1800s to 1920, the attention of feminists focused upon school elections with an intensity that has never been equalled. Our feminist sisters a century ago demanded changes and fought for increased participation in the society. The movement was finally swallowed up in the singular issue of national suffrage and then lie dormant for a long period during which the numbers of women teachers and administrators in our schools steadily declined. Women's attention to school matters did not again claim such universal appeal until the concentration upon the 1972 passage of Title IX which has been hailed as the most significant educational legislation for women and girls in the U.S.A. Title IX states, "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance."

Although there has been an unprecedented focus on the federal government concerning women and education, there has also been work at the state and local levels. Women and men teachers appear on programs in local and state conventions with presentations such as "what's good for kids, boy kids and girl kids." Women in professional organizations have demanded presentations about equity and lobbied for women as speakers. At one state convention of administrators, the number of women presenters grew from 19 percent in 1976 to 32 percent in 1978. That happened because of the intense pressure applied by an activist group in the state. The national affiliate of this organization, The

American Association of School Administrators, only had 13 percent and 15 percent women presenters in those same years (Schmuck, 1982). Most professional educational organizations now have women's caucuses; the American Educational Research Association, an international association, has an active women's caucus. Programs for training teachers and administrators have criticized sexist curriculum materials (Sadker and Sadker; 1982, Schmuck, Butman and Person, 1982). These educational activities are not only spearheaded by self-acknowledged "feminists" (sometimes a perjorative label in the educational community); they are often led by women and men who, having seen the damaging effects of sex stereotyping in their own lives, have made equality of opportunity an important educational goal for their own sons and daughters.

In this paper I cannot review all the educational activities devoted to equalizing educational opportunities. A forthcoming book, Achieving Sex Equity in Education, edited by Susan Klein with over 50 authors, to be published by Johns Hopkins Press, is a compendium of 1,000 pages documenting such educational efforts.

How are these activities related to the status of women in education? Unfortunately it's too early to tell; there are data indicating that more women are preparing and applying for positions in such male dominated areas such as administration (Stockard, 1982, Schmuck and Wyant, 1982); there are data showing differences in the aspirations and career plans of the new cohort of females (Edson, 1982, Haven, 1980). But the latest national statistics concerning sex stratification in American public schools show no major changes. The national data are collected only biennially and any shift in employment patterns will probably not show up for several years.

The Structure of Education: Discrimatory Socialization and Mobility

I have shown already that males and females are equally represented as employees of schools, but their positions within education are sex segregated. How does sex differentiation occur? All careers in education begin as a classroom teacher. And even those men and women who have achieved positions of leadership, such as superintendent or high school principal, have followed similar paths to achieve their goal (Paddock, 1981). It would appear there is little difference; men and women together populate the classrooms in the country and follow similar paths to leadership. But there is a difference for males and females, as I will show in this section. And it is this difference in experience that leads to such disparate outcome statistics for men and women in leadership. Men and women do not bring the same hopes, dreams and aspirations to the field of education, nor do they share the same experiences as teachers in schools. Men's and women's day-to-day experiences as employees of public schools serve to maximize rather than minimize the differences between the sexes. Culturally defined sex roles create differences, organizational contingencies create differences and attributions to educational leaders create differences. In the following section I will review five stages of career development and show the process of sex differentiation at each stage.

Introduction to Teaching

The literature is clear about the personal life characteristics which differentiate men and women educators. In fact, most of the literature from 1960 to 1975 has focused almost exclusively on the argument that differences between women and men in education are due to the differences in their socialization as boys and girls that subsequently appear in their careers in

education. Although I will report some studies that have followed this line of thinking, the literature is too exhaustive to report all of them. I refer to Adkison (1981) and Haven (1980) for excellent comprehensive reporting of the wealth of socialization research.

The socialization argument is supported by the following data, which show that males and females in education differ in their personal aspirations for careers in education.

The choice of education as an occupation. Women choose teaching because they enjoy working with children; men choose teaching as a career choice (Paddock, 1981; Prolman, 1983). The implications of this difference in motivation toward a career is also evident in the research; whereas women expect to remain a teacher, men expect and plan to move out of classroom teaching.

Interest in educational careers. Women teachers, compared to men teachers, express less interest in becoming educational administrators (Barter, 1959; Dias, 1976). Most of this research was done, however, in the 50s and 60s; Haven reports that the "gap may be narrowing in the 70s and 80s." As she points out, in the 50s and 60s it appeared inappropriate for a woman to openly express a desire to be upwardly mobile thus actively restricting their career choices; the norms are changing and "women may now feel it is appropriate for them to join their male colleagues in openly seeking career advancement" (Haven, 1980, p. 18). Edson (1981) is studying this new conort of women--those who are actively seeking positions of authority and responsibility in the educational hierarchy. Her study of aspirants and my experiences with women educators today, suggest that some basic changes are occuring in women's attitudes toward careers in education. Only a decade ago I described the "who me?" woman (Schmuck, 1975)--the woman who was reluctant and even self-deprecatory about

assuming a position of visible authority and power. That woman, when faced with a direct request from a superordinate within the school, often responded with the self-denigrating response, "Who, me?" More and more women today, in all age groups, are comfortable with accepting such responsibility, and no longer hesitate to seek such positions. As one of Edson's interviewees reported, "When I decided to go for this job, I looked around at the kind of principals there were. I thought, Lord, I can do it at least as well as they're doing it. If they can, I can!" (Edson, 1981, p. 184).

Family considerations. It is impossible to discuss women's careers in any field without a discussion of the relative roles of females and males within the family. While it is still generally presumed that a married woman's first obligation is to her family, and a married man's first obligation is to his career, in American society this view seems to be undergoing some change. For instance, in one study of teachers in the state of Michigan, 34 percent of women and 21 percent of men reported that women could be both successful in educational administration and happily married. Of course that leaves 66 percent women and 79 percent men who did not believe a woman could successfully manage both a career and a marriage (Fisher, 1980). Obviously women and men in education still continue to differ with regard to family responsibilities. Women who are administrators, compared to their male counterparts, tend less often to be married, they tend less often to have children, and if they have children, the children are older than the children of the males in administration. Although the norms may be changing, it remains clear that family responsibilities remain a clear difference influencing the career choices of men and women in education.

In most research comparing the personal aspirations and attributes of male

and female educators, men and women who already hold certain positions are asked to reflect on their past choices about their career and these results are compared. And, as I have shown, the research indicates differences in the personal life attributes of males and females who have pursued a career in education leading to administration. We know little, however, about those women and men who choose to remain in teaching. Researchers have not adequately focused on the teacher; research has focused on those who move out of teaching. We also know little about the organizational processes that differentiate men and women teachers. The following analysis shows how males and females are treated differently within the school organization.

Stage 1--Teaching as Anticipatory Socialization

The literature on career socialization documents a rich interplay between personal orientations and environment supports and incentives. A person begins learning early to develop incrementally the skills, attitudes, and orientations of those people who occupy the roles to which one aspires. And, in turn, one is given information, support and opportunities to develop further. That interplay has been termed anticipatory socialization. It is at that stage that one sees the beginning of the dramatic separation between men's and women's experiences in the public schools. Most women remain, as Catherine Marshall notes, "culturally defined," in their socially prescribed role as teachers or in lower management positions, because the anticipatory socialization process does not work the same way for women as it does for men. Women and men bring different aspirations and hopes to their role as teachers, and the organization gives a clear preference to males in its support, encouragement and incentives for further professional development (Marshall, 1982; Proiman, 1985). The rewards are not as great for those who choose to remain in teaching as for those who

chose to leave teaching for administration. And the rewards are more the privilege of males than females.

To understand better this phenomenon, Gilbertson (1981) studied the verbal interaction between principals and their faculty in four elementary schools, two of the principals were female and two were male. She recorded a total of 509 different interactions and noted that principals, regardless of sex, interacted more with male teachers than with female teachers. That is consistent with the findings on teacher's interactions with girls and boys. Moreover, male teachers, regardless of the sex of the principals, were more often consulted by the principal than were the female teachers about school organizational matters. Thus male teachers were given an opportunity to enlarge their views about school operations. Gilbertson reports, "The evidence substantiates the view that schools typically reflect the cultural norms of sex-role orientation and collectively perceive of men as being more capable in areas of task performance and management." Gilbertson's focus was on the larger school organization--the focus was not on the excellence of instruction provided in the classroom.

Another example of anticipatory socialization was given by a male high school principal who reported that he was worried that he encouraged male teachers more than female teachers to pursue leadership roles. He did consciously encourage females he thought had leadership potential. Nevertheless, he said, "I take a 'no' more quickly from a female; with a male, I keep persisting." Because the norms strongly favor the encouragement of men, women who do receive encouragement are the exception.

Wheatly (1982) gives us a different view of the interplay between personal orientations and job incentives. Using the arguments of Kanter, she presents a case of opportunity differences; there are jobs with "high" opportunity and

those with "low" opportunity. A job with high opportunity not only offers upward mobility (and presumably all teachers have the same chance), but it allows a person to grow, to develop, to use skills, to learn new skills, and to be recognized and rewarded for his or her skills. Teachers are not often rewarded with those opportunities in providing excellent classroom instruction. In schools, most opportunities for rewards lie outside the classroom. Persons in high-opportunity jobs are labeled "movers," persons in low opportunity jobs are labeled as "stuck," and that is a self-fulfilling prophecy. One's role within the organization influences one's appropriate behavior; thus "those in moving positions are not only in a position of being eligible for advancement, but also tend to behave in ways that confirm the organization's selection of them as people who should be rewarded. Those who are 'stuck' tend to act in ways that confirm the organization's lack of attention to them" (Wheatley, p. 257). Men more often than women become department chairs, committee chairs, head coaches, and vice principals. They move more often into positions of visibility and high opportunity.

Given the current reward structure of schools, women teachers tend to remain "stuck"; men teachers tend to become the "movers." Lortie, in his book Schoolteacher elaborates the view of women teachers as being "stuck"; there are no opportunities for finding rewards that other professions offer through money, status and influence; teaching is "career-less." And women, who bring with them the culturally defined aspirations for teaching and who receive fewer organizational rewards and less encouragement to becoming "movers" than men, remain "stuck" as teachers. The definition of teachers as "stuck" perhaps is one of the most compelling arguments that teaching is an imperiled profession." Yet it is continuously asked, in a field that is fairly equalized: Why are there so few women leaders? In light of my review of the "baggage" brought by men and

women teachers and what happens to them during the first stages of career development, a better question might be: How have any women at all left classroom teaching for other positions in the educational hierarchy? And another equally important question: Why do we hold in such low regard those women and men who devote their lives to classroom instruction?

Stage 2--Aspiring to Leadership

Despite women's culturally defined orientation as teacher and the school's failure to afford them the same opportunities they offer men, some women do aspire to positions of leadership and responsibility. These are the women who have been referred to as "marginal." The term itself implies that male is the norm and women are the deviants.

Ortiz (1982) illustrates the differences between men and women in the aspirant roles--those at the first stages of upward mobility. Men tend to move vertically through a series of line positions entailing adult supervision; women tend to move horizontally through staff positions entailing student supervision. Our cultural views about women's place in schools are so strong that women who aspire to leadership are defined differently than women who remain in teaching. We develop new categories to explain the deviants. Catherine Marshall (1982) refers to these aspiring women as "in transition," a stage in-between the culturally defined appropriate role as teacher and the newly emerging self-defined roles. "When a woman enters a male sex-typed career, she defies norms and is an exception to the usual pattern for informal socialization (which) set the odds against her. The aspiring woman faces organizational realities, with little guidance, support or incentive" (p. 4, 5). It is little wonder then, that among 116 women aspirants surveyed in Oregon, 55 percent of

them listed "perceived discrimination in the field" as a major barrier. That barrier was second only to "lack of experience" (Edson, 1981). At the aspirant stage women receive not only less support or encouragement, they face obstacles unknown to male aspirants. And they become a new category of women educators.

Stage 3--Formal Preparation

In most states in the U.S.A. one must be credentialed to be an administrator. There are approximately 250 preparatory programs at colleges and universities in the U.S. Some programs offer a masters degree or a doctorate in Educational Administration; some only offer the administrative certificate required to obtain and hold the a position.

National data about women enrolled in educational administration programs are not available. One study of five western states showed a steady increase of women students in educational administration programs. In Oregon, for instance, the percentage of women students in educational administration rose from 12 percent in 1974 to 23 percent in 1979. And other states such as Colorado, California, and Washington in 1979 had over 50 percent women enrolled in administration programs. California showed the biggest increase, from 20 percent in 1974 to 63 percent in 1979 (Stockard, 1982). That increase is encouraging. Indeed one reason given for the decline in numbers of women elementary principals is the increasing professionalism, which has in turn required additional training. However, it seems apparent that more and more women are obtaining the formal requirements for administrative jobs. Yet in their administrative training programs women are faced with professors nearly all male, and the books they use are sex biased (Schmuck, Person and Butman, 1982). Whether those women will enter administrative positions in schools,

however, remains an unanswered question. Formal training is only one element in administrator preparation.

Stage 4--Informal Preparation

The traditional rational perspective on organizations presumes institutions are blind to race, sex and other ascribed characteristics. Yet the literature on the career mobility of women and minorities in schools is clear about at least one point; schools are not meritocracies. Rather, mobility rests on the hereditary privilege of being white and male. Nowhere in the literature is that hereditary privilege so clear than in the informal stage of career development. "The professional characteristics of school organizations serve to make the informal system of allocating administrative positions more powerful than in any other organization (Adkison, p. 326). Access to job information, sponsorship, opportunities to be visible (and thereby interact with the "gatekeepers" of the profession) and social contacts with those who share similar concerns have been well documented by Adkison (1981), Ortiz (1982), Schmuck (1975, 1981, 1983), Marshall (1982), and Proiman (1982).

It is in the stage of informal preparation that women activists have focused much of their attention and activity. Women have developed a replacement strategy for the informal system of social contacts, job information and sponsorship which has worked to the advantage of men and the disadvantage of women. The replacement strategy is called "networking". Networking is the active coalition of women and some men to ameliorate women's exclusion from information, sponsorship, and the social contacts that have worked so well for upwardly mobile men. It is an exciting new phenomenon in our country. Women in all professions recognized and identified a ladder of career advancement that

worked to the advantage of men and to the disadvantage of women. It is called "the old boys' network" or the "old boys' club" or the "buddy system." Women are now forming their own networks. Organizations such as Northwest Women in Educational Administration, have been formed to provide support, encouragement and information to women who aspire to educational leadership positions. They provide conferences, regional meetings, and job-listings and spread the conscious message that women need each other to succeed.

In comparing the system that has worked so well for men and the replacement strategy for women, there is an obvious discrepancy. The system that has worked so well for men has three major characteristics; it is unconcious, it is informal, and it is private. Women's networks are just the reverse. The new strategy of women has none of those elements; women have consciously duplicated an unconscious process, formally constructed an informal association and publically operated a private system.

It's too early to evaluate the effects of that replacement strategy of women. But if the recent popular books are any indication, women in all spheres of professional life are learning the trade secrets and using them in their own career advancement.

Stage 5--The Achievers

Despite the winnowing of women at each stage of the preparatory ladder, some women do achieve positions of educational leadership in our country. What can we say about them? The literature on sex differences in administrative performance is clear; men and women do not differ markedly on how they perform their jobs. Gross and Trask, in The Sex Factor in the Management of Schools, reported some differences between the behavior of male and female elementary

school principals. These differences, however, were very small; sex accounted for less than 5 percent of the variance. In a review of that study and a replication study of their own, Charters and Jovick (1981) said:

> Behavioral scientists believe that many conditions are influential in shaping the performance of leaders and in determining job satisfaction; these conditions can be classified, and they require volumes for their elucidation. It is little wonder that investigations that focus on one specific attribute of these matters, such as the leaders' sex, can only capture a small portion of the wondrous variation that people exhibit in their working-day lives (p. 328).

While there continues to be interest and research on male-female differences, I agree with Charters and Jovick that sex, as a biological attribute, will yield little in explanatory power in itself.

But even though males and females do not to any significant degree behave differently as administrators, a substantial body of research shows that there are different attributions given to male and female leaders. For instance, people expect males to act decisively and expect females to consult with others before coming to a decision. The expectations of others regarding male leaders and female leaders can help us to understand how males and females come to experience the same positions differently. Women's devalued role in the society, for instance, is carried over into the work place; females suffer a legitimation gap (Fennel, 1978). As Fennell points out,

> In work situations there are undesirable consequences of insufficient legitimacy of women in leadership roles. We do not think that such difficulties as women's unwillingness to play a strong leadership role are due to lack of "leadership skills". Instead, we reason that the organizational authorities are actually less likely to back up the authority of a female incumbent in a leadership role than they would be to support a male incumbent.

Some compensatory training is available to women, such as assertiveness training or special programs for women in management. I believe these programs are not necessary; women have the same capacity for leadership as men. The problem is in the system variables that discriminate, not in the skills of women. We have come around full circle; women teachers in the classroom experience different anticipatory socialization mechanisms from men, and women encounter sex discrimination unknown to men all the way through the organizational structure of schools. Even those women who finally achieve positions of power and responsibility do not have the same advantages of their male counterparts; they lack legitimacy because they are women.

Although my reporting of the sex differentiation process in school organizations may sound despairing, I do not feel despair. Indeed, the very description of these processes in writing and in continued research can increase our understanding and provide instruction on how to change this discriminatory system. The work of attribution theorists, the investigations of male and female behavior in small groups, and the work of expectancy theorists can, I hope, change practice. These arenas of research are fairly new. I expect in another decade we will understand more. I find it heartening to see the work of social scientists turning to these issues; they are women and men who are not accepting what has always seemed obvious, but instead are asking questions so we may see things in a new way.

The Legal Remedies of the 20th Century Women's Movement

On my office wall there is a cartoon by political cartoonist Mike Peters; it shows a picture of the founding "fathers" of the United States grappling with the wording of the Declaration of Independence. The cartoon reads, "Look guys,

why don't we just say that all men are created equal--and let the little ladies look out for themselves." And that is what the "little ladies" of the 19th and 20th century have been doing ever since. One purpose of the 20th century feminist movement has been to instill the concept of sex equity in American law. The Equal Rights Amendment reads, "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." This amendment would finally correct our founding fathers' exclusion of women in the U.S. Constitution. Although this goal still eludes us, there have been significant alterations in United States law which guarantee in policy, if not in practice, equality in opportunity in employment in schools. In this section I will briefly describe those laws and show how they relate to women's employment in schools.

The Policies and the Laws

While most of the important laws regarding educational employment emerged since the 1960s, one can trace important incremental changes in the lawmakers' and courts' views regarding the place of women in the society. In the 19th century, the prevailing view was the law should serve as a "protector" for women. Women were not expected to participate as equals in the society. The law was to uphold women's sacred and exalted position. This view was best expressed by Justice Bradley in 1872 who reviewed a case to determine whether Ms. Bradwell could practice law in Illinois. Justice Bradley, in affirming women's special place in society disallowed Ms. Bradwell to practice law by saying:

> "The civil law, as well as nature herself, has always recognized a wide difference in the respective spheres and destinies of man and woman. Man is, or should be, woman's protector and defender. The natural proper timidity and delicacy which belongs to the female sex evidently unfits it

> for many of the occupations of civil life. . . .(Bradwell v. the State of Illinois, 1872, cited in Babcock).

Of course, that image of woman on a pedestal did not account for the thousands of women workers who were not in such an exalted position or those who needed wages and were only paid a fraction of what men earned for the same work. That pay differential also existed in education; in Massachusetts from 1840 to 1865 women teachers were paid approximately 1/3 the wages of men (Katz, 1968, p. 224). In the 100 years since Justice Bradley's opinion, we have seen women practicing law and the appointment of the first woman to the Supreme Court, Sandra Day O'Conner. We have seen also laws guaranteeing women's equal pay in schools.

There are many federal and state laws prohibiting sex discrimination. The purpose of this paper is not to recount these laws; interested readers can refer to an excellent compendium, Sex Discrimination and the Law: Causes and Remedies, by Babcock, Freeman, Norton and Ross (1976). Only a few of the laws are specifically pertinent to women in education.

The Fourteenth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, the cornerstone of equality, reads that no state shall "deprive any person of life, liberty, or property; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of laws." Whereas "any" person did not in earlier days include women, today there is a more enlightened view (Eastwood, 1979). In 1954 the landmark case of Brown vs. Board of Education, the Supreme Court declared that "separate educational facilities were inherently unequal" and urged schools to desegregate with "all deliberate speed". While the focus of this decision was about racially segregated schools, the Brown decision served as an important backdrop for the formation of laws and regulations with regard to sex discrimination.

In 1963 The Equal Pay Act, was passed that guaranteed no pay differentials on the basis of sex. However, while men and women in education must be paid on the same basis for the same work, there remains clear differences in the salaries earned by men and women in public schools. Factors such as promotion, extra duties, and prosperity of school district, account for these differences. Although the laws guarantee equality in policy, the roles that men and women play in education result in pay differentials in practice.

The Civil Rights Act, of 1964, the most comprehensive legislation since the Emancipation Proclamation that freed slaves, also included women. Freeman (1975) reports, ironically, that the inclusion of women was a last minute attempt to defeat the legislation; indeed the primarily male Congress treated the inclusion of sex as ludicrous. Nevertheless the Civil Rights Act included prohibitions against sex discrimination.

Title IX, of the Education Amendment Acts, was authorized in 1972 and is the most significant legislative reform regarding sex equity in schools. "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance." This law, passed by the U.S. Congress in 1972, was accompanied by very specific regulations which cover almost all aspects of schooling. In 1982, the courts ruled that Title IX also covered equality of employment in education.

I would like to bring a personal note to the description of Title IX. When Title IX went into effect in 1975, my daughter was 10 years old. The school district in which my children were enrolled took their charge most seriously and tried to equalize educational opportunities. Other districts were not, however, so eager to comply with federal statutes. Without doubt, the opportunities

afforded my daughter--especially in school athletic programs and encouragement of girls into higher math--were different for her than just a few years earlier. She was on the cutting edge of educational reforms for girls in the U.S.A. and I have no doubt her school experiences would have been quite different without Title IX.

In summary, in the U.S.A., we have made significant progress in mandating equality in the schools. Furthermore, the federal government has provided an organizational structure to help implement those policies. Their importance is especially in evidence in 1984 as the current administration has tried to dismantle that federal bureaucracy to assist efforts toward equality.

Helping to Implement Equality

The United States Congress has passed laws to assure equality in schools and has provided the organizational arrangements to help implement those laws.

The Womens' Educational Equity Act Program (WEEAP): Authorizes funding for model programs of national, statewide or general significance to achieving educational equity for girls and women. Grants offered to individuals and institutions have included programs such as, BORN FREE, a program to reduce sex stereotyping in career development; the Sex Equity in Educational Leadership Project, a model to increase the number of women school administrators in Oregon; women studies programs to add to the curriculum information about women in various fields and disciplines; New Pioneers, a program to expand sex role expectations for elementary and secondary students. Those approximately 100 products or programs funded by WEEAP are listed and available for purchase by the Education Development Center, Inc., 55 Chapel Street, Newton, Massachusetts. This has been the first federal program to assist women in education. There are

concerns, however, that its future is in jeopardy; the Reagan administration has been culpable of attempting to dismantle this all too new program (Mondale, 1983).

Sex Desegregation Assistance Centers: Ten regional offices in the U.S.A., assist school districts by providing consultants, materials, training and resources to local school districts. In 1982 the centers provided direct service to about 5,000 school districts, or about 1/3 of the school districts in the U.S.A. (Sadker, 1982).

State Departments of Education: Each state is required to assign a Sex Equity Coordinator in the State Department of Education. Specified responsibilities range from creating programs of awareness of sex typing to improving vocational opportunities for women. Thus, there is in place, a designated person in each state with responsibility for providing equal educational opportunities in vocational education.

It is difficult to measure the effect of laws in classrooms and schools. Policy and practice are not directly connected. It is clear, however, that in the U.S.A., legal equality must continue to be a predominant concern to attack the nascent paternalism in education and the patriarchy of the society. Concerned citizens cannot let these dramatic gains erode away by inaction or disenfranchisement by the current administration.

Our feminist sisters a century ago sought to improve education for girls and women. The heritage they left us has enriched our lives as well as the lives of our grandmothers and mothers. There has been no back-pedaling from those early reforms; through their efforts women gained access to education and to employment in schools. They believed education was women's right and they

stridently and softly demanded a role for women. It is that history of our foremothers that convinces me that future gains in educational equality, and work such as evidenced by this symposium to document and analyze women's role as educators, must continue to be made both stridently and softly. It is the empowerment of a guiding feminist ideology that will bring about changes in the structure of education and the implementation of equality under the law. Perhaps with those reforms we will come to value the role of women that women have always played in schools.

WOMAN'S "TRUE" PROFESSION AND THE NEGLECT OF WOMEN: A FEMINIST PERSPECTIVE

Despite women's greater participation in schools for the last century and a half, most educators and historians have treated the American educational experience as if it were the province of men (Burstyn, 1983; Kerber, 1980; Biklin, 1983; Tyack, 1974). While it is true that most widely published educational treatise have been written by men, and that men, by and large, have held the most prestigious leadership positions in our public schools and universities, it is not true that women have not written about education nor that women have not been a significant voice in the development of our U.S. school system (see, for instance, Woody, 1929; Goodsell, 1931; Willard, 1919; Hoffman, 1982). In education as in other fields, the ideas and experiences of women have not received equal attention with those of men; women have been ignored. Burstyn explains, and I agree, that the neglect of women's experience and participation stems "from the proposition that an unequal division of power and authority between the sexes in American society entails the subordination of women's ideas and experiences to men" (p. 7).

Perhaps the most damning accusation of male bias comes from Weisskopf (1978), who said, "The natural and social sciences have out of self-interest, hubris, and ignorance participated in the systematic oppression of women" (p. 267). Perhaps nowhere has this accusation been so properly leveled than in education.

Education has been seen as the highest calling of woman--indeed, it is her "true" profession. Yet simultaneously, her experiences, her writings, her ideas are neglected and ignored. The educational roles filled by women in schools are seen only as secondary to those of men; women "hold jobs," men have "careers." Why is this so? Why do individuals and institutions so flagrantly discriminate and continue to devalue the role of women?

Our accumulated wisdom has been guided by the presumptions of patriarchy; guided by the blinding assumption that women are inferior to men. The assumption about the inferiority of women has crept into our accounting of educational history, has misguided researchers, and has perhaps even influenced educational policies in the U.S.A. The purpose of feminist theory is to lead to corrective action; this paper and this symposium is devoted to that purpose.

The Universalist Bias

The study of "man" in society and in institutions has been just that, the study of males. The experiences of men are seen as the universal truth; women either fit into the universal truth or are "exceptions to the norm." This bias is not, however, categorically true in education. Women are not totally neglected, they are merely kept in their place. Women are presumed to be the teachers, especially elementary teachers, so there is often reference to the teacher "she." Management is seen the province of men as exemplified in the article entitled "Dear Mr. Administrator" by McNamara (cited in Schmuck, 1982).

The universalist bias is most apparent in the study of educational administration, the management function of our school systems. Men have almost always been the subjects for research. When women have been in the subject

pool, the findings have been aggregated so as not to differentiate on the basis of sex. One study is a good case in point: Gross and Herriott's 1965 national study of principals ignored the sample of women elementary principals in the original study; it was 11 years later that Gross and Trask (1976) reanalyzed the original data and published The Sex Factor and the Management of Schools, one of the first books to pay attention to the role of women in management.

The universalist bias is characterized also by the predominate research focus on those positions dominated by males. An example is Wolcott's book, The Man in the Principal's Office. The literature about the position held by most women--the elementary school teacher--is relatively sparse compared to the literature on management (Freedman, 1983; Biklen, 1983; Lortie, 1975). I wonder, and ask, not rhetorically, has our focus upon school management been initiated by our belief that those positions worthy of study are those occupied by men or have men moved into those positions because we have portrayed them as the most worthy positions? Certainly, in the U.S., teaching is believed to be of a lower order than management; this is well stated by Friedman (1983), ". . . For many teachers, the more grounded and sure they were in classroom issues, the less they were assumed to contribute to or be valued by life outside the classroom (p. 20).

Teaching has been characterized as a "semi" or "quasi" profession (Lortie, 1975). One cause for the label is no doubt the predominance of women in the field. The presumption is that since a profession is the province of men, those fields populated by women cannot be a profession. Furthermore, teaching is described as "career-less". As Lortie (1975) put it, for women, teaching was a one-step career; for most men teaching was merely one step in a multilevel career (1975). Indeed, the study of careers has been so defined as to exclude

the traditional experiences of women in the society; volunteerism, for example, is not valued. Careers are defined as an orderly sequence of vertical moves in the educational hierarchy. The study of careers in education has been the study of men in education. Again, the universalist bias is in operation; men have careers, women have jobs.

The Machismo Bias

Not only are males the topic of study in education, researchers, regardless of sex, are guided by what Jesse Bernard refers to as the "machismo factor" in research (1973). She says:

> The male bias . . . seems to be related also to methodological and technical predilections, for, as we have been reminded so often, we tend to choose our problems on the basis of available techniques rather than on the basis of intrinsic importance. In sociology, as in psychology, a masculine bias has been embedded in the structure of inquiry; the most prestigious methods have tended to be those that yielded "hard" data. And thereby hangs a most interesting tale, a tale of the part played by what might well be called a "machismo factor" in research.

Although it is not clear whether feminist researchers employ different methods, it is clear that women researchers focus on different topics than men. In one study, reviewing 10 years of an educational administration journal, clear facts emerged: women authors represented only 4 percent of the published articles, and women with men co-authors represented 12 percent of the published articles. Women's concentration tended to be about career patterns in education; the primary concentration of male authors was on school finance and politics (Schmuck, Butman, Person, 1982). Another investigation of six major educational research journals over five years showed that sixteen percent of the

articles were written by women only, 28 percent co-authored by women and men. Women's concentrations were in areas different than men; articles published by women were more likely to focus on women in education, although only 13 percent of all articles were about this topic (Lockheed, 1980). Women researchers also engage in more interdisciplinary research than men, perhaps prompted by the lone woman in a discipline working with another lone female in another department across the campus. Women's concentration on women has been to correct the past research which has been focused on men. Gerda Lerner, a historian, says the first step in corrective action is to ask, "Where are the women?" And Julia Sherman, a psychologist, shows that most of the findings in psychology do not only not generalize to women, in fact, they put women at social risk (1978).

> The psychology of women opens every can of worms in the field of psychology. Predictions for males do not hold for females, thus revealing the weakness of the theories involved. Sloppy methodology and conceptualization, which would have little social impact in other areas, became of acute importance to the social risk of females as a group. These errors and confusions constitute a long list of research abuses. One can only hope that reiterating them will serve to alert scholars, editors and readers to possible trouble spots.

The new scholarship on women, or feminist research, is redefining the content and methods of study in all fields. The new scholarship is more than the study about women, however. What it is, is yet unknown. It is more than revisionism in history as written about by Gerda Lerner (1979) or Elise Boulding (1976), or in religion as written about by Mary Daly (1973), or in the social sciences by Jean Miller (1976) or Jesse Bernard (1973). We are engaged in a paradigm shift; our past constructs of reality are undergoing change. We are, indeed, engaged in the process of questioning the obvious. This was well stated by Alfred North Whitehead:

> When you are criticizing the philosophical epoch, do not chiefly direct attention to those intellectual positions which its chief exponents feel it necessary explicitly to defend. There will be some fundamental assumptions which adherents of all the various systems within the epoch unconsciously presuppose. Such assumptions appear so obvious that people do not know what they are assuming because no other way of putting things has ever occurred to them (quoted in Mary Daly, Beyond the Father, Beacon Press, 1973).

By pointing out the obvious neglect and treatment of women in education, perhaps we will come to a new way of putting things.

The Devalue of Education Bias

The field of education has never held high social status in the U.S.A.; now the crisis is even greater. Duke says in his book, Teaching: The Imperiled Profession, "Teachers have always had to cope with criticism, but my reading of educational history fails to find another era when their profession is so imperiled" (1984). Our social history reveals attitudes persistently equivocal about the status of education. Sykes (1983) says, "From the earliest days of our republic teachers have as often been the source of ridicule, condescension, or pity as of respect" (p. 98). Not only has the field been denigrated in the public's view, there has been a view of the teacher as deficient. Waller, in 1932, characterized education as the "refuge of unsalable men and unmarriagable women." Perhaps the public view is best characterized by the cliche, "those who can, do; those who can't, teach; and those who can't teach, teach teachers." I believe no other western world country exhibits such amolvalence about teachers; on the one hand we entrust them with our most precious resource, our youth and on the other hand we castigate their intelligence, their skill, and their person. We offer no respect or reverence; we offer few material inducements,

few opportunities for advancement and almost no rewards for dedicated service.

The devalued role of education is inextricably entwined with the important roles that women have played in education and their devalued status in the society. In an excellent collection of papers in the Handbook of Teaching and Policy (Shulman, Sykes, 1983) various authors point time and time again that the changing role of women in the society is one major factor in the imperiled status of education. What is particularly exciting about this book is the treatment of the sex factor as manipulable variable rather than a cultural given. The authors objectively and often poignantly give credit to women's work in statements such as "women's undervalued labor constituted a hidden subsidy to education" (Sykes, p. 113). One reason for the imminent educational crisis is that woman's "true" profession now competes with more lucrative and rewarding work. "No longer is teaching the zenith to which most college educated women can aspire" (Sykes, p. 113). Yet women still constitute the majority of teachers. The positive social value of a field is inversely related to the number of women in the field; this concept has been documented time and time again. Perhaps it was best said in 1949 by Margaret Mead when she was among the first to point out that males are granted higher social status than females. Whatever activities men do are more highly valued than activities women do; if men decide to "cook, hunt, weave, dress dolls or collect hummingbird wings," these will be the activities valued in the society.

There are many plans for upgrading the profession of teaching in the U.S.A. In 1984 there are dozens of educational reform documents and each one calls for an upgrading of educators in our public schools. Perhaps some of these plans will work and we will see a new respect and more rewards for educators. The crisis in education is, however, unequivocally related to women's devalued position in the society.

The Contemporary School Marm Bias

Curiously, the women's movement may be putting the woman school teacher in a bind. Our past stereotypes about teaching as the "appropriate" sphere for women may be undergoing a backlash. Our current understanding about sex segregation in the labor force may have created a kind of counterdependency among young women entering professions today. Our concern about women's equal place in the society may, in fact, be driving competent women away from the profession of education. Adkison (1981) points out that in 1966, there were 760,000 women in colleges of education. In 1979, that number was reduced to 601,000 while women in schools of business in those same years increased from 204,000 to 819,000. What about the woman who chooses to become and remain a teacher? Indeed in the eyes of her more liberated peers, the contemporary school marm may appear out of it, an anachronism. Whereas the 19th century teacher heralded the call of teaching and school management issues were seen as a lower order activity, in the 20th century the call of management is seen as the priority issue. This is illustrated well by the implied meaning in the excellent work of C. Marshall on women's career mobility in education. Marshall defines the woman teacher as one who remains "culturally defined"; it is the woman who moves up the vertical ranks of the educational hierarchy, within the domain of the males, who goes through "transition" and eventually arrives at "self definition." The assumption is clear; women who teach do so because they have not freed themselves from cultural stereotypes about women's place. Perhaps we are increasing the peril of an already imperiled profession by driving women away from what used to be their highest calling. Perhaps a stereotype in reverse is operating--women who enter teaching do so because they are seen as adopting the denigrated position of women in the society.

The successful teacher today is not rewarded primarily for classroom activities; the successful teacher today is encouraged to look beyond the classroom and to participate in all aspects of the bureaucracy from participating in union activities to district curriculum committees, from meetings with district specialists to governance responsibilities at the school. Teaching today has a management orientation (Lightfoot, 1984).

Efforts such as the Boston Women's Teachers' Group (Freedman, 1984) or the research agendas of groups such as the Special Interest Group on Women of the American Educational Research Association, that focus on the professional lives of women in education, will perhaps coincide with larger scale social educational reforms. Perhaps for the first time we will have a reform platform which simultaneously recognizes the value of teaching and the value of women. I am not so parochial that I believe the crisis in education is <u>only</u> related to women's devalued role in the society. I am, however, sufficiently convinced that they are so intimately related that changes in one must result in changes in the other.

TABLE 1

Number and Percentage of Elementary and Secondary Teachers in U.S. Public and Private Schools by Sex, 1929-1976[a]

Year	Male		Female	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1929-30	154,983	16.3	795,178	83.7
1939-40	212,084	21.6	769,182	78.4
1949-50	221,635	21.2	823,590	78.8
1959-60	430,436	27.8	1,119,314	72.2
1969-70	1,140,660	40.6	1,669,243	59.4
1975-76	1,399,600	43.1	1,846,740	56.9

a. Source: Grant, W. Vance and Leo J. Eiden, Digest of Educational Statistics. Washington, D.C., National Center for Educational Statistics, 1982 p. 11.

TABLE 2

Percentage of Male Elementary School Teachers
in U.S. Public Schools, 1929-1981[a]

Year	Total Number of Teachers	Percentage of Male Elementary Teachers
1929-1930	640,957	10.5
1939-1940	575,200	11.7
1949-1950	589,578	9.0
1959-1960	833,772	14.1
1969-1970	1,126,467	15.6
1973-1974	1,175,980	16.7
1980-1981[c]	1,186,000	16.9

a. Sources for 1929-1974: W.V. Grant and C.G. Lind, Digest of Education Statiscics, 1979, National Center for Education Statistics, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1979, p.11.

b. Figures for the years before 1959-1960 do not include Alaska and Hawaii.

c. Source for 1980-81: W.V. Grant and Leo J. Eiden, Digest of Educational Statistics, Washington, D.C., National Center for Education Statistics, 1982, p. 52.

TABLE 3

Percentage of Male Teachers, Librarians, and Other Nonsupervisory Instructional Staff in Elementary Schools in the United States, 1869 to 1974[a]

Year	Percentage
1869-1870	38.7
1879-1880	42.8
1889-1890	34.5
1899-1900[c]	29.9
1909-1910	21.1
1919-1920	14.1
1929-1930	16.6
1939-1940	22.2
1949-1950	21.3
1959-1960	29.0[b]
1969-1970	32.4[b]
1973-1974[d]	33.5[b]

a. Source: W.V. Grand and C.G. Lind, Digest of Education Statistics, 1979. National Center for Education Statistics, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1979, p.38.

b. Estimated by the National Center for Education Statistics.

c. Note: Most schools in the United States prior to 1900 were elementary buildings.

d. The 1980-81 Digest of Educational Statistics does not give comparable information about male staff in elementary schools.

TABLE 4

Sex Composition of Public High School Teaching Force 1929 to 1981[a]

Year	Number of Teachers	Male (%)	Female (%)
[a]1929-1930	213,306	34.9	65.1
1939-1940	300,277	42.2	57.8
1949-1950	324,093	43.8	56.2
1959-1960	521,186	52.8	47.2
1969-1970	896,786	53.5	46.5
1973-1974	979,468	53.6	46.4
1980-1981	997,500	51.1	48.9

a. Source: Adapted from W.V. Grant and C.G. Lind, Digest of Education Statistics, 1979, National Center for Education Statistics, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1979, p.11.

b. Source: W.V. Grant and Leo J. Eiden. Digest of Educational Statistics, Washington, D.C., National Center for Educational Statistics, 1982, p. 52.

TABLE 5

Number and Percentage of Same Sex Teachers
at the Elementary and Secondary Levels, 1982-1983[a]

	Elementary Teachers		Secondary Teachers		Total
	Number	% of Same Sex	Number	% of Same Sex	
Female	981,262	66.8%	474,148	33.2%	100%
Male	195,449	28.6%	487,713	71.4%	100%

a. Source: National Education Association, Estimates of School Statistics, Washington, D.C., 1982-1983.

TABLE 6

Subjects Taught by Male and Female Teachers in Public Secondary Schools in the United States in 1971[a]

	Male (%)	Female (%)
Home economics	0	100.0
Foreign language	26.5	73.5
Business education	33.3	66.7
English	35.4	64.6
Health and physical education	45.8	54.2
Art	46.1	53.9
Music	70.4	29.6
Social Studies	76.8	23.2
Science	85.3	14.7
Industrial arts	95.4	4.6
Agriculture	100.0	0

a. Source: Adapted from National Education Association, Status of the American Public School Teacher, 1970-1971, Research Report 1972-R3, p.29.

Note: Differentiation by sex in subject matter taught is not available in the Status of the American Public School Teacher, 1980-81. Nor is such information available in other national data sources.

TABLE 7

Estimated Percentage of Public School Administrators By Sex, 1972 - 1982[a]

Position	1972-73[b]		1976-77[c]		1981-82[d]	
	Male	Female	Male	Female	Male	Female
Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents	96.1	3.9	94.6	5.4	96.2	3.8
Principals	92.2	7.8	87.1	12.9[e]	84.0	16.0
Other Administrators (Supervisors, directors)	35.0	65.0	45.4	54.6[f]	Not Available	

a. Note: These data are from three different sources and categories of administrators change in each data collection. There is no data available from national data collection sources on sex of administrators in the 1980s.

b. Source: Adapted from National Education Association Research Division, 26th Biennial Salary and Staff Survey of Public School Professional Personnel, 1972-1973, Washington, D.C. 1973, pp.9-10.

c. Source: B. Foster and J. Carpenter, Statistics of Public Elementary and Secondary Day Schools. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1976, p. 20.

d. Source: Jones, Effie and Xenia Montenegro. Recent Trends in the Representation of Women and Minorities in School Administration and Problems in Documentation. Arlington, VA, American Association of School Administrators, 1982, pp.4,9,12.

e. This category includes principals and assistant principals.

f. Source: Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, Elementary-Secondary Staff Information (EED-5) Annual Surveys. 1976, unpublished, reported in Havens, Elizabeth, "Women in Educational Administration: The Principalship," Washington, D.C., National Institute of Education. Contract 400-79-0698, 1980, p.2.

TABLE 8

Percentage of Female Elementary School Principals
in U.S. Public Schools, 1928-1978

	Percentage of Female Elementary Principals
1928	55%
1948	41%
1958	38%
1968	22%
1971	21%
1973	20%
1978	18%

Source: Pharis, William L. and Sally Banks Zakariya. The Elementary School Principalship in 1978: A Research Study, Arlington, VA., National Association of Elementary School Principals, 1979, p.5.

Bibliography

Adkison, Judy, "Women in School Administration: A Review of the Research," Review of Educational Research, V.51, no.3, Fall, 1981, pp. 311-343.

Babcock, Barbara, Ann Freeman, Eleanor Norton, Susan C. Ross, Sex Discrimination and the Law: Causes and Remedies, Boston, Little Brown & Co., 1975.

Bailey, Susan, correspondence from Chief State School Officers, Washington, D.C.

Barnes, Thelma, "America's Forgotten Minority: Women School Administrators," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, April, 1976, pp. 87-93.

Barter, A.S., "The Status of Women in School Administration - Where Will They Go from Here?", Educational Horizons, 1959, pp. 37, 38, 72-75.

Bartholemew, Bernard and Susan Gardner, Status of the American Public School Teacher, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1982.

Berg, Barbara, The Remembered Gate,

Bernard, Jessie, "Homosociality and Female Depression," Journal of Social Issues, 1976, pp.209-247.

Bernard, Jessie, "My Four Revolutions: An Autobiographical History of the American Sociology Association," In Joan Huber (ed.) Changing Women in a Changing Society, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1973, pp.11-29.

Biklen, Sare Knopp, "Teaching as an Occupation for Women: A Case study of an Elementary School," NIE Grant G-81-007, unpublished paper, Syracuse, N.Y., 1983.

Burstyn, Joan, "Women in the History of Education," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, 1983.

Boulding, Elise, The Underside of History, Boulder, Colorado, Westview Press, 1976.

Butler, Matilda, Education: The Critical Filter, Women's Educational Equity Communication Network, San Francisco, 1979.

Byrne, Eileen, Equality of Education and Training for Girls, Commission of the European Communities, Brussels, July, 1978.

Byrne, Eileen, Women in Education, New York, Methuen, Inc., 1979.

Byrne, David, Susan Hines, Lloyd McCleary, The Senior High School Principal: The National Survey, Arlington, VA., NAASP, 1978.

Charters, W.W. Jr., Thomas Jovick, "The Gender of Principals and Principal/Teacher Relations in Elementary School," in Schmuck, Charters, Carlson (eds.) Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials, New York, Academic Press, 1981.

Clement, Jacqueline, "No Room at the Top," U.S. Office of Education, 1977.

Clement, Jacqueline, "Sex Bias in School Administration," in Biklen and Brannigan (eds.) Women and Educational Leadership, Lexington Press, 1980.

Collier-Thomas, Betty, "The Impact of Black Women in Education: An Historical Overview," Journal of Negro Education, V.51, no.3, 1982, pp. 173-180.

Cubberly, Ellwood, Public School Administration, (Boston, 1916), rpt. in R. Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency (University of Chicago Press, 1967), p.15.

Daly, Mary, Beyond God the Father, 1973.

Dessaeir, C.I., and C.E. Van Vleuten. Education and Equality of Opportunity for Girls and Women," Standing Conference of European Ministers of Education, 11th Session, The Hayne, June, 1979.

Dias, Sally, "A Study of Personal, Perceptual and Motivational Factors Influential in Predicting the Aspiration Level of Women and Men toward Administrative Roles in Education," unpublished dissertation, Boston University, 1975, (University Microfilms no. 75-20, 946)

Duke, Daniel L., Teaching: The Imperiled Profession, Suny, 1984.

Duniway, Abigail, Pathbreaking, New York, Schocher Books, 1971. Reprinted from James, Kerns, and Abbott edition of 1914.

Eastwood, "Feminism and the Law," in Women: A Feminist Perspective, (Jo Freeman, ed.), Palo Alto, Mayfield Press, 1979, pp. 385-403.

Edson, Sakre, "If They Can, I Can: Women Aspirants to Administrative Positions in Public Schools," in Schmuck, Charters, Carlson (eds.), Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials, New York, Academic Press, 1981.

Ellenburg, F.C., "Elementary Teachers: Male or Female," Journal of Teacher Education, 26, Winter, 1975, pp.329-334.

Fennell, M.L., P. Barchas, E. Cohen, A. McMahon and P. Hildebrand, "An Alternative Perspective on Sex Differences in Organizational Settings: The Process of Legitimation," Sex Roles, V.4, no.4, 1978, pp.589-604.

Finigan, Michael, "The Effects of Token Representation on Participation in Small Decision-Making Groups," Economic and Industrial Democracy: An International Journal, V.3, no.4, Nov.1982, pp.531-550.

Flexner, Eleanore, Century of Struggle: The Women's Rights Movement in the United States, Cambridge, MA, The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1959.

Freedman, Sara, Jane Jackson and Katherine Boles, "Teaching: An Imperiled Profession," in Handbook of Teaching and Policy, Shulman, Sykes (ed.), New York, Longmans, 1983, pp. 261 - 299.

Freeman, Jo, "The Women's Liberation Movement: Its Origins, Organization, Activities, and Ideas," in Women: A Feminist Perspective, Jo Freeman, ed., Palo Alto, CA, Mayfield Press, 1975.

Friedan, Betty, The Feminist Mystique, 1963.

Gaertner, Karen, "Administrative Careers in Public School Organizations," in Schmuck, Charters, Carlson (eds.), Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials, Academic Press, 1981, pp.199-220.

Gilbertson, Marilyn, "The Influence of Gender on the Verbal Interactions Among Principals and Staff Members: An Exploratory Study,"in Schmuck, Charters, Carlson (eds.), Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials, Academic Press, 1981, pp. 199-220.

Goodsell, Willystine, Pioneers of Women's Education in the United States, 1931.

Grant, W.V. and C.C. Lind, Digest of Educational Statistics, Washington D.C., Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1979.

Gribskov, Margaret, "Feminism and the Woman Administrator," in Women and Educational Leadership: A Reader, Sara Bichlen and Marilyn Brannigan eds., Lexington, Mass., D.C. Heath and Company, 1980.

Gross, Neal and Herriott Robert, Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry, New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1975.

Gross, Neal, Anne Trask, The Sex Factor and the Management of Schools, New York, John Wiley and Sons, 1976.

Hansot, Elizabeth and David Tyack, "The Dream Deferred: A Golden Age for Women School Administrators," Policy Paper No. 81-C2, Palo Alto, CA, Stanford University, 1981.

Havens, Elizabeth, "Women in Educational Administration: The Principalship," National Institute of Education, Washington, D.C., 1980.

Hoffman, Nancy, Woman's True Profession, Westbury, N.Y., Feminist Press, 1982.

Hole, Judith, Ellen Levine, Rebirth of Feminism, New York, Quadrangle Books, 1971.

Jones, Effie and Xenia Montenegro, Recent Trends in the Representation of Women and Minorities in School Administration and Problems in Documentation, Virginia, American Association of School Administrators, 1982.

Katz, Michael, The Irony of School Reform, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1968.

Kalvelage, Joan, "The Decline in Female Principals Since 1928: Riddles and Clues," Eugene, Oregon, Sex Equity and Educational Leadership Project, ERIC # 163-594.

Kerber, Linda, Womans Place is in the School: The Impact of Women on American Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 1980.

Kleiman, Carol, Womens Networks, Lippincott and Crowell Publishers, New York, 1980.

Klein, Susan, et al., Achieving Sex Equity in Education, Johns Hopkins Press, Forthcoming.

Kohnstamm Institute, Education and Equality of Opportunity for Girls and Women. Standing Conference of European Ministers of Education, 11th Session, The Hague, June, 1979.

Lerner, Gerda, The Majority Finds Its Past, New York, Oxford University Press, 1979.

Lightfoot, Sara, "The Lives of Teachers" in Handbook of Teaching and Policy, Shulman, Skyes, eds., Longman, New York, 1983, pp.241-260.

Lockheed, Marlain and Katherine Hall, "Conceptualizing Sex as a Status Characteristic," Journal of Social Issues, V. no. , 1976, pp.111-124.

Lockheed, Marlaine and Sandra Stein, "The Status of Women's Research in Educational Publications, Educational Researcher, V.9, no.2, 1980, pp.1-15.

Lortie, Daniel, School Teacher, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Los Angeles Unified School District, Guide to Schools and Offices, Los Angeles, California, 1976-1977.

Marshall, Catherine, "Organizational Policy and Women's Socialization in Administration," unpublished paper, 1982.

Mead, Margaret, Male and Female, San Diego, Morrow, 1949.

Melder, Keith, Beginnings of Sisterhood, New York, Schocken Books, 1977.

Miller, Jean, Toward a New Psychology of Women, Boston, Beacon Press, 1976.

Moynihan, Ruth, Abigail Scott Duniway, Yale University Press, 1982.

National Education Association, Estimated Statistics of Public Schools, Washington, D.C., 1983.

National School Boards Association, "Women on School Boards," Evanston, Illinois, National School Boards Association, 1976 and 1983.

Ortiz, Flora, Career Patterns in Education: Women, Men and Minorities in Public School Administration, New York, Praeger, 1982.

Paddock, Susan, "Male and Female Career Paths in School Administration," in Schmuck, Charters, Carlson (eds.) Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials, New York, Academic Press, 1981.

Prolman, Sandra, "Gender, Career Paths and Administrator Behavior," paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Montreal, Canada, 1983.

Ratner, Ronnie Steinberg, Equal Employment Policy for Women. Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1980.

Sadker, Myra and David Sadker, Sex Equity Handbook for Schools, New York, Longman, 1982.

Schmuck, Patricia, 1975, Sex Differentiation in Public School Administration, National Council of Women in Educational Administration, Arlington, VA, 1975.

Schmuck, Patricia, "Women in School Administration in Belgium," Unpublished paper, 1981.

Schmuck, Patricia, Sex Equity in Educational Leadership: The Oregon Story, Washington D.C., Education Development Corporation, 1982.

Schmuck, Patricia, Laurie Butman, Linda Person, "Analyzing Sex Bias in Planning and Changing," paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, March 1982.

Sexton, Patricia Cayo, "The Feminized Male," Scientific Debate, Clarice S. Stall (ed.), New York, Addison-Wesley, 1973.

Shakeshaft, Charole, Woman's True Profession: A Teaching Guide, Westbury, New York, The Feminist Press, 1982.

Shakeshaft, Charole and Patricia Palmieri, "Goodby Miss Dove/Hello Ms——— A Re-evaluation of the Woman Teacher," Unpublished paper, Hofstra University, 1984.

Sherman, Julia and Florence Denmark, The Psychology of Women: Future Directions in Research, 1978.

Shulman, Lee and Gary Sykes (eds.), Handbook of Teaching and Policy, New York, Longman, 1983.

Smock, Audrey Chapman, Women's Education in Developing Countries, New York, Praeger, 1981.

Steiger, JoAnn and Eleanor Szanton, Women's Participation in the Education Division of HEW, Washington, D.C.: National Advisory Council on Women's Educational Projects, 1977.

Tyack, David and Elizabeth Hansot, Managers of Virtue, New York, Basic Book, 1982.

Weisskapf, Susan, "Sexism, Inequality and Education," Harvard Educational Review, V.48, no.2, pp. 267-278.

Wheatley, Meg, "The Impact of Organizational Structure on Issues of Sex Equity," in Schmuck, Charters, Carlson (eds.), Educational Policy and Management: Sex Differentials, New York, Academic Press, 1981.

Willard, Emma, Plan for Improving Female Education, Middlebury, Vermont, 1819.

Williams, Peg, "The Impact of Anti Sex Discrimination Laws on the Employment of Oregon School Principals," unpublished dissertation, University of Oregon, 1981.

Wolcott, Harry, The Man in the Principal's Office, Holt, Rinehart, Winston, 1973.

Woody, Thomas, A History of Women's Education in the United States, New York, 1929.